

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated August 21, 2006 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 60-91 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. New claims 92 and 93 have been added. No new matter has been added. Therefore, claims 60-93 are currently pending in the application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Claims 60-63, 66-77, 80-87, and 90-91 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,697,806 of Cook ("Cook"). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons which follow.

Claim 60, upon which claims 61-73 are dependent, recites a method which includes requesting, by a terminal, a specified service to be at a disposition of said terminal. The terminal is configured to perform communication via at least one communication network, and each network is equipped with service processing entities. The method further includes analyzing the request by an analyzing entity associated with the at least one communication network. The analyzing entity is configured to be associable with a plurality of communication networks. The method also includes deciding, by the analyzing entity, that the requested specified service is associated with a specific one of the service processing entities of a specific one of the at least one communication network. In response to said decision, routing communication messages

associated with said terminal via said analyzing entity to said specific one of said service processing entities within said specified communication network.

Claim 74, upon which claims 75-89 are dependent, recites a system including a request unit, at a terminal, configured to request a specified service to be at a disposition of said terminal. The terminal is configured to perform communication via at least one communication network, and each network is equipped with service processing entities. The system also includes an analyzing entity associated with said at least one communication network configured to analyze the request, and configured to be associable with a plurality of communication networks. The system further includes a decision unit, at the analyzing entity, configured to decide that the requested specified service is associated with a specific one of the service processing entities of a specific one of the at least one communication network. The system also includes a routing unit, responsive to the decision unit, configured to route communication messages associated with the terminal via the analyzing entity to the specific one of the service processing entities within the specified communication network.

Claim 90 recites an analyzing entity including a receiver configured to receive a request for a specified service to be at a disposition of a terminal. The terminal is configured to perform communication via at least one communication network, and each network is equipped with service processing entities. The analyzing entity further includes a processor configured to analyze the request, and a decider configured to decide whether the requested specified service is associated with a specific one of the service

processing entities of a specific one of the at least one communication network. The analyzing entity also includes a router, configured, in response to a decision of the decider, to route communication messages associated with the terminal to the specified service processing entity within the specified communication network. The analyzing entity is associated with said at least one communication network, and configured to be associable with a plurality of communication networks.

Claim 91 recites a terminal including requesting means for sending a request that a specified service to be at a disposition of the terminal to an analyzing entity associated with the at least one communication network for analyzing the request. The analyzing entity is configured to be associable with a plurality of communication networks and configured to decide that the specified service is associated with a specific one of the service processing entities of a specific one of the at least one communication network. The terminal also includes sending means for sending messages regarding the specified service to the specific service processing entity within the specified communication network via the analyzing entity, when the request has been routed to the specific service processing entity by the analyzing entity. The terminal is configured to perform communication via at least one communication network, the network being equipped with service processing entities.

As will be discussed below, Cook fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims, and therefore fails to provide the features discussed above.

Cook discloses an access communication system which provides access between a user system and a plurality of communication networks. The plurality of communication networks provide services to a user in the user system. An access communication system includes a local database system and an access server that is connected to the user system and the plurality of communication networks. The local database system receives a user logon. The local database system then processes the user logon to determine if the user is allowed access to the access communication system based on a local database system. The local database system then provides access to the access communication system to the user in response to the determination that the user is allowed access based on the local database system. The local database system then generates an authorization query for a second database system external to the local database system in response to the determination that the user is not allowed access based on the local database system. The local database system receives and processes an authorization response indicating whether the user is allowed to use the access system from the second database system. The local database system then provides access to the access communication system to the user in response to the authorization response that allows the user to use the access communication system.

Applicants respectfully submit that Cook fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims. For example, Cook fails to disclose or suggest “deciding ... that said requested specified service is associated with a specific one of said service processing entities of a specific one of said at least one communication network,” as

recited in claims 60 and 74, and similarly recited in claims 90 and 91. According to Cook, a plurality of service providers may offer the same services. As a result, designating a specific service provider, according to Cook, does not necessarily designate unambiguously a specified service. Thus, Cook is unable to decide “that said requested specified service is associated with a specific one of said service processing entities of a specific one of said at least one communication network.” Therefore, in addition, Cook does not teach “requesting ... a specified service to be at a disposition of said requesting terminal” as recited in claims 60 and 74 (and similarly recited in claims 90 and 91), because requesting a network does not necessarily correlate to selecting a particular service. In other words, a specified service as claimed in the present claims cannot be distinguished on the basis of a service provider which might provide such a service. Furthermore, the access authorization of Cook does not correspond to the provisioning of services to a terminal, as recited in the present claims.

More specifically, Cook does not disclose or suggest that a terminal requests a specified service, as recited in the present claims. Rather, according to Cook, the access server generates a query to the terminal and the terminal thereafter provides a reply to the query. Based on the reply from the terminal, the access server generates a message indicating the available services which are then provided to the terminal (Cook, Column 14, lines 30-50). Thus, Cook does not disclose that the terminal **requests** a specified service. As such, the signaling of Cook does not correspond to that of the present invention.

Further, Cook fails to disclose or suggest “routing communication messages associated with said terminal via said analyzing entity to said specific one of said service processing entities within said specified communication network,” as recited in claim 60 and similarly recited in claims 74, 90 and 91. Rather, according to Cook, the user is connected to the selected service and, as a result, the user is connected to a respective service network 530 or 540. However, Cook does not disclose routing communication messages associated with said terminal via said analyzing entity to said specific one of said service processing entities within said specified communication network.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that Cook fails to disclose or suggest “each network being equipped with service processing entities,” as recited in claims 60, 74, 90, and 91. The Office Action took the position that the plurality of communication entities of the present invention corresponds to blocks 530 and 540 in Figure 4 of Cook. Cook discloses that “those service networks 530 and 540 could be voice or data systems such as the PSTN, Internet, public data networks, and private data networks” (Cook, Column 9, lines 26-29). Cook does not disclose or suggest, however, that service networks 530 and 540 are equipped with service processing entities.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Cook does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 60, 74, 90 and 91. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 60, 74, 90, and 91 be withdrawn.

Claims 61-63, 66-73, 75-77, and 80-87 are dependent upon claims 60 and 74, respectively. Consequently, claims 61-63, 66-73, 75-77, and 80-87 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon claims 60 and 74, and for the specific limitations recited therein.

Claims 64-65 and 78-79 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0041146 of Davis et al. ("Davis"). The Office Action took the position that Cook discloses all of the elements of the claims, with the exception of the identifier being carried in the header of the request message. The Office Action then cites Davis as allegedly disclosing this element of the claims. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons which follow.

Claims 64-65 depend from claim 60, and thus are patentable for at least the reasons claim 60 is patentable. Claims 78-79 depend from claim 74, and thus are patentable for at least the reasons claim 74 is patentable. Cook is discussed above. Moreover, Davis does not remedy the deficiencies of Cook. Davis is directed to connection allocation technology. Davis aims to overcome network difficulties by providing intelligent, high speed connection allocation. Accordingly, Davis does not address the features described above, with respect to which Cook is deficient. Thus, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 88-89 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0005132 of Nguyen et al. (“Nguyen”).

Cook is discussed above. Nguyen is directed to distributed service creation and distribution. Nguyen, in response to receiving a query for a particular service, identifies a provider of the particular service to the network connected device by a director service utility. The network connected device may then contact the service provider directly and receive an application (i.e. an executable file) for accessing the particular data network service.

Claims 88-89 are dependent upon claim 74. As discussed above, Cook fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 74. Furthermore, Nguyen does not cure the deficiencies in Cook as Nguyen also fails to disclose or suggest the features of the invention discussed above. As such, the combination of Cook and Nguyen does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 88-89.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 60-93 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by

telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Majid S. AlBassam  
Registration No. 54,749

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802  
MSA:jf

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time